



March 7, 2007

Subject: The Land Development Ordinance Committee

The Land Development Ordinance Committee (LDOC) met Wednesday, March 7, 2007, at 4 p.m., in the second floor Seminar Room located at The Plaza, 100 W. Innes Street, to discuss rewriting Salisbury's ordinance code. In attendance were George Busby, Bill Burgin (Co-chair), John Casey, Mark Lewis (Co-chair), Brian Miller, Rodney Queen, Jeff Smith, Jake Alexander, Phil Conrad and Victor Wallace.

Absent: Karen Alexander, Steve Fisher and Bill Wagoner

Staff Present: Dan Mikkelson, Preston Mitchell, David Phillips, Janet Gapen, Bryan Alston and Jewell Stokes

The Meeting was called to order with Bill Burgin (Co-chair) presiding. The minutes of the February 28, 2007, meeting were accepted as published.

Preston Mitchell distributed LDOC Agendas.

CHAPTER SUMMARIES

Dan Mikkelson picked up on the continuation of Chapter 9.0, Infrastructure, Platting and Connectivity (*Draft 2.21.07*).

9.6 Connectivity

- | | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| B | Street Layout
Already in existing Ordinance | Neutral |
| | | |
| C | Traffic Calming (Reserved) will be evaluated on its own merit independent of the LDOC recommendation. | |
| | | |
| D | Block Length: maximum and average specified
The block length was described as intersection-to-intersection. It was mentioned that having short block lengths would be keeping with 2020; however, short block lengths are not necessarily appropriate for all transects. Allowing the block | Less Restrictive |

length to be averaged gives the developer more flexibility than the current code. It was also mentioned that block length is variable through the CD process.

D 3 (Pedestrian Path) was deleted.

E Intersection Offsets Less Restrictive

F Required Stubs: one per 1200' adjacent developable property More Restrictive
It was suggested that verbiage be added to F1 "to include street stubs from approved plans". It was also suggested to add to F1 "an exception for industrial zoning adjacent to any other zoning."

Under Section 9.6 F 4 the *conditions* are no longer listed and should be added. Under Section 9.6 F 5 it was decided to delete the expressions in the last sentence (or dead head) and (permanent or temporary).

G Cul-de-sacs:
UR, MRM, NM, DMX districts More Restrictive
RR and GR districts Neutral
HB, LI, HI, HS, IC, MHD, CMX districts Less Restrictive
G2 prohibits multiple branching cul-de-sacs. It was recommended to adopt 30 units per single entrance per Fire Code D107. There was discussion to stop sidewalks at the bulb of the cul-de-sac. Dan recommended leaving the current standard in place because it was developed by a Planning Board committee and had been through a public review process. However, LDOC voted to terminate sidewalks at the bulb-out of permanently dead-ended cul-de-sacs.

9.7 Access Management: new standards More Restrictive
The standard for major thoroughfare is consistent with NCDOT. The standard for minor thoroughfares/connectors is new. The standard for local streets is the same as the current code.

There were no comments from the public, and the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

JS